Journal of Glocal Studies

No.5 (2018) 49-71

Glocal Studies

Coming to Terms with Western Social Science
Three Historical Lessons from Asia

Stéphane Dufoix

University of Paris Nanterre (France)
stephane.dufoix@wanadoo.fr
(Received 12 December 2017. Accepted 2 February 2018)

Abstract
Written from a perspective of presenting the history of sociology differently, essentially by taking into consideration its development in other parts of the world than the only Euro-American sphere, this article focuses on how studying the history of sociology in Asia can be helpful to shed some different light on the discipline as a whole. In this respect, it will consider three specific moments: the inception moment in the late 19th and early 20th century (that most of the time implies a specific relationship to one other country or part of the world); the counter-hegemonic national moment, that has to do with the refusal of the epistemic hegemony (roughly between the 1930s and the 1950s); and the the transnational moment when, starting in the late 1960s, the struggle against hegemony takes an additional dimension through the establishment of continental or transcontinental institutional or personal networks or the appropriation of some counter-hegemonic concepts, ideas or au thors.

Keywords: Hisory of sociology, Asian sociology, Indigenization, Internatio nalization of sociology

From now at least two decades and a half, books and articles have flourished elaborating about the rise of counter-hegemonic currents in the social sciences on the different continents. With some exceptions, these studies have been focusing on a period starting in the early 1980's when claims for indigenous sociologies or anthropologies began to be more and more visible within the most legitimate academic frameworks such as the International Sociological Association and its newly created journal *International*

Sociology (1986). If the early 1980's certainly mark a tipping point in the international visibility of non-Western sociologies, they by no means constitute a point of departure. They only do so if visibility is the criterion by which we measure the existence of social studies. Part of the historical amnesia that characterizes most writings on the history of sociology when it comes to Latin America, Eastern and Central Europe, Africa, the Arab world and Asia, precisely has to do with such a focus and with the mere ignorance of the various developments of sociology in these regions throughout the 20th century and even before in some cases: only what is immediately available in the highest-rank disciplinary journals seems to be worth writing about. This amnesia, just like the one associated with the widespread forgetting of the links between sociology and colonialism (Steinmetz, 2013 and 2017), finds an explanation in the post-WWII development of the discipline when the Western – and most specifically American – epistemic (but also political, economic, international) domination made it possible to proclaim the coming of age of sociology as a universal science.

Exploring the sociological past, be it made less visible by its geographical location, the language in which it was practiced or its relative absence in the events or journals considered in the international arena of sociology to be the most important, provides a different image and tells a different story. This article is part of a larger research project on the internationalization of sociology from the mid-19th century onwards, the main aim of which being the attempt to rewrite the history of the discipline not from its margins – which would make it some form of counter- or alternative history – but including what historians nowadays – and for now quite a long time – have seen as its margins. Making them reenter the story does not necessarily imply giving non-Western sociologists[1] a predominance ; yet it implies assessing the real importance of sociologies developed outside the Western world in the last century and a half. Indeed, engaging oneself into this task entails having a wide historical and geographical vision, first to try to encompass what is usually forgotten when addressing the history of sociology, i.e. its appropriation in some countries outside Europe and North America in the late nineteenth century. In Asia – since this article most specifically deals with Asia –, Japan and China (in this respective order) were pioneers in this enterprise, while Asia is still today almost entirely left out of studies of early sociology.

Keeping together a wider scope in time and space also makes it possible to get a

[1] Even the expression «non-Western» is untrue since most histories of sociology only do take a few Western countries into consideration, mostly France, Great-Britain, Germany, Italy and the United States. It might be interesting to notice that, at least in three of those countries (France, Great-Britain and Italy), sociology was not an institutionalized discipline until the post-WWII period.

better view of some processes that, due to their almost complete invisibilization within what was considered as the most legitimate venues of sociology (journals, publishers or international associations) for a number of decades, only seemed to be absent. The process of appropriation – or indigenization as it often called – is one of those. The lack of interest in the kind of sociology developed outside the Western area made historians of sociology – who more often than not happen to be mere sociologists – blind to the long-standing reflections and debates that took place in those countries about the various way to develop a more "domestic" sociology. The rather recent internationally visible interest – since the 1980s roughly – about "indigenous sociologies" seems to be the tree hiding the forest of much older strivings (for a congruent statement, see Brisson, 2015, p. 549). Understanding indigenization much more as appropriation, indeed a very basic social process by which a foreign word, idea or concept is given a place into a specific language, environment, culture and professional milieu, than as transplantation, offers a wider insight into the social, political, and intellectual reality of the deployment of sociology as a word or as a set of ideas (not yet as a discipline) in the late 19th century.

In this respect, the history of sociology in Asia is very instructive. By quickly reviewing three periods – extending on nearly a century, from the early 1880s until the late 1970s – in that history, I would like to emphasize the importance of taking into consideration three particular moments of appropriation when attempting to work on a world history of sociology: *the inception moment* (that most of the time implies a specific relationship to one other country or part of the world); *the counter-hegemonic national moment* when the nationalization of the discipline (that can be witnessed in the case of recently independent countries, of countries having discovered social science recently, or of countries having recently been in a situation of a relative epistemic domination despite their long tradition of social science like France, Italy or Japan after WWII) has to do with the refusal of the epistemic hegemony; and the transnational moment when the struggle against hegemony takes an additional dimension through the establishment of continental or transcontinental institutional or personal networks or the appropriation of some counter-hegemonic concepts, ideas or authors (for an example of links between Latin America and Africa, see Bayle, 2015)[2]. I will notably give some insights into the seldom mentioned instance of the Human and Social Development Programme of the United Nations University, whose Socio-cultural Development Alternatives in a Changing World Project, headed by the Egyptian sociologist (living in France) Anouar

[2] Which of course does not deny the prior existence of other non-academic transnational networks. On these South-South networks, see Devés-Valdez, 2012.

Abdel-Malek, organized two Asian symposia in Japan in 1978 and 1979.

Transplantation or appropriation? Inception and Nationalization of Sociology in Asia

If *sociology* as a word was coined in France in the 1830s by Auguste Comte, it was translated in other languages (English, Italian, Spanish among others) in the mid-19th century, thus paving the way to the progressive development of a new body of thought in Western Europe, Northern America as well as Central and Latin America. It's often forgotten that Asia was not absent from the sociological world scene in the late 19th century. In Japan, the new words *shakai* (社会) and *shakaigaku* (社会学), respectively translating *society* and *sociology* were coined in 1875 and 1878 (Saito, 2015, p. 74-79; Nishitani, 2013, p. 295-297; Odaka, 1950, p. 402). Herbert Spencer's *Social Statics* was published in Japanese in 1882 while the *Principles of Sociology* were in 1885. If courses in sociology were already delivered from 1878 at Tokyo Imperial University by the American professor Ernest Francisco Fenollosa, who had graduated from Harvard in philosophy in 1874 and was an admirer of Spencer (Brooks, 1962, p. 106), the first Japanese Professor of sociology, Toyama Shoichi, was appointed in 1892 at Tokyo Imperial University (Yazawa, 2013, p. 138). In China too, a translation from Spencer[3] – in this case *The Study of Sociology*, first partially translated in 1897 before the book was released in Chinese in 1902 – indicates the first real contact with sociology when the famous translator Yan Fu coined the word *qunxue* (群学) while, the very same year 1902, another Chinese translator, Zhang Taiyan, started using the word *shehuixue* (社会学) – that became predominant soon after – as a mere borrowing from *shakaigaku* in his translation of Kishimoto Tadashi's *Shakaigaku* book (Gianninoto, 2013, p. 282-291, especially p. 288). However, these translations of sociology in Japanese and Chinese should less be understood as Western transplants in these two countries than as complex importations that cannot be dissociated from a more general trend: Westernization is an issue that is all the more divisive among the political, economic and cultural elites as it is inscribed within in specific historical contexts of major political and social transformations, and of rivalry between regional powers (in the particular cases of Japan and China, see Huang, 2012; Howland, 2002, p. 171-182; Lippert, 2001). Translation is in

[3] In many other countries like the United States, France or Italy, sociology also becomes established through the translation of either *The Study of Sociology* (1873) or *Principles of Sociology* (1874). These works stand at the heart of the course given at Yale by William Graham Sumner starting in 1875 and they occupy a great place in the Elements of Sociology – indeed a very Spencerian title – course delivered by Frank Wilson Blackmar at the University of Kansas starting from 1890. The *Principles of Sociology* get translated in French from 1878 and in Italian from 1881. On the world diffusion of Spencer's works, see Lightman (2016).

this respect a displacement and not a simple transposition: it has to be considered as both a form of epistemic dependence on notions that had been coined elsewhere and as a form of national appropriation – it's even more obvious in the Japanese case than in the Chinese one – of a thought from abroad. Such a perspective about the diffusion of the word *sociology* – not to be confounded with the diffusion of the discipline since it hardly exists as such anywhere in the world in the 1880s and 1890s, with the relative exception of the United States – offers ways to identify the various meanings it takes according to the different national settings and to paying more attention to the local conditions of possibility for the establishment of a sociological tradition, thus making it possible to rethink and possibly write a less diffusionist history the discipline. From the late 19th century onwards, the structuration of Japanese sociology is certainly the highest one in the world at that time outside the United States, with a specific department of sociology at Tokyo Imperial University from the early 1880s; a national association of sociology established in 1898 (Shakaigaku Kenkyūkai); a sociological journal, *Shakai*, founded in 1899) before it took a new name, *Shakaigaku Zasshi*, after 1902; and, some years later, an Institute of Sociology (Nihon Shakai Gakuin) founded in 1913 by Takebe Tongo, one of the most famous Japanese sociologists of the early 20th century.

Spatially and temporally, the deployment of sociology does not obey to one logic only. For instance, within a single colonial empire such as the British colonial empire, unique, the forms taken by the implantation of sociology differ widely. In India, the British sociologist Patrick Geddes is appointed Professor in the newly created Department of civics and sociology at the University of Bombay in 1919 (Munshi, 2013). Five years later, his student G.S. Ghurye, whom he had sent to England in order to complete his formation and who earned his PhD from Cambridge University in 1922, succeeded him as the Head of the Department. Under his direction the sociology curriculum develops at high speed: the first doctorate of sociology in India is awarded in 1938 (Patel, 2002, p. 273)[4]. By the late 1930s, there were four distinct departments of sociology in India (Bombay, Calcutta, Lucknow, and Mysore).

Conversely, the institutionalization of sociology in Australia is rather late in comparison. The first chair in sociology dates back to 1959 at the University of New South Wales, while the Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand is not founded until 1963 (Beilharz, Hogan, and Shaver, 2015; Harley and Wickham, 2014; Baldock and Lally, 1974), exactly the same year as the Pakistan Sociological Association (Gardezi, 1975, p.415). This late implantation has to do with the peculiar disciplinary

[4] Exactly twenty years before the establishment of a Doctorate in Sociology in France (1958).

status of sociology in Britain – thus showing how much Australian social science was epistemically dependent – where the academic anchoring of the discipline only takes place after WWII (Abrams et al., 1981; Halsey, 2004; Holmwood and Scott, 2014).

China also stands among the pioneer sociological countries in Asia, more especially in Republican China after 1911. The first sociology courses were delivered in American Christian missions in China (the very first one in 1906 at St John's University in Shanghai), and the first department of sociology was founded in 1913 at the Hujiang College of the University of Shanghai by the American Methodist Episcopalians (Chen, 2018, p. 12). The early 1920s saw an acceleration in the structuration of the discipline in the country. The first department of sociology (and history) in a Chinese university was established in Xianmen in 1921. Coming back to China in 1921 with a doctorate in sociology earned in 1920 from Clarke University, Yu Tianxiu established the Chinese Society of Sociology in 1922 and founded the *Shehuixue Zazhi*, the first Chinese journal of sociology. Some years later, in 1929, another sociological association, the Southeast Sociological Society, was created, along with a new journal, *Shehuixuekan*, by some Chinese sociologists teaching in Shanghai and Nanjing. This association was to become, through its merging with the Yanjing Sociological Society, the Chinese Sociological Society with Sun Benwen as its chairman (Chen, 2018, p. 18). By 1930, there were eleven distinct sociology departments in China (King, 1978, p. 38), a figure that would keep growing: they were seventeen in 1934 (Wong, 1979, p. 19). In his 1948 report on Chinese sociology, Sun Benwen recorded 143 sociology instructors in China, the great majority of them (131) being Chinese (on the state of Chinese sociology by the late 1940s, also see Sun, 1949).

Not only do these three Asian countries show an important institutional anchoring between the late 19th century and the mid-20th century; their history also indicates that the issue of the relationship to be maintained with Western sociology was already present from the start. Each of those countries was mostly influenced by one specific national or anthropology in the first place during the first half of the 20th century: British and then French ones in the Japanese case; British and then American ones in the Chinese case; British one in the Indian case. However, despite these influences and templates, each of those sociologies can adequately be presented as Japanese, Indian and Chinese, and not only as "sociology in Japan", "in India", or "in China" because of the indigenous trends that manifested themselves in the interwar period. In Japan, sociology was subject, just like other sciences, to a specific nationalist framing in which the Japanese polity was considered exceptional – the Tennosei (天皇制) –, thus making any aspect of social life, science included, engaged into the promotion of this exceptionalism (Kawamura, 1994).

In China, the figure of Sun Benwen is emblematic in this respect. With a MA in sociology from the University of Illinois in 1922, some time spent at Columbia with Franklin Giddings and William Ogburn, a PhD from New York University in 1925 and a post-doctoral study at the University of Chicago with Robert Park and William Thomas, his return to China was marked by the intention to professionalize the discipline along the American model (Li, 2012) but also, progressively, to give it a specific Chinese content, as shown for instance by the Chinese Sociological Association led by Sun Benwen calling in 1937 for the "establishment of a Chinese sociology" (Dirlik, 2012, p. 17). In India, British sociology and anthropology were in the interwar period the dominant model, even if G.S. Ghurye's traditional sociology, largely in line with British anthropology, was tainted with a strong Hindu nationalism. A different vision was claimed by some important figures of the Sociology Department at the University of Lucknow, such as Radhakamal Mukerjee and Dhurjati Prasad Mukerji who advocated the necessity to build a more "Indian" sociology. Mukerjee in particular challenged the universality of Western concepts and social science and tried to replace them with Indian concepts that could become the core of a new universal sociological theory (Thakur, 2012 and 2015).

The examination of the inception moment in these three countries shows that they cannot be considered as mere recipients of a transplanted Western sociology in the first half of the 20th century. The second moment of challenging hegemony is a national one, and I'll only quickly mention some elements of it because this moment is not the best known in the history of the discipline and investigating it would imply a large and thorough examination of how sociology got established in a growing number of states worldwide. It could seem that this is the same moment as the inception one, but sticking to this first impression would give a false image of the period. In fact, examining the world history of sociology cannot be limited to a simple juxtaposition of national disciplinary histories. The rise of sociology as a discipline (and not only as a body of thought) in Japan, China and India took place at a time when it was also still rising in a very small number of countries (the United States, France, Germany, Italy) before it emerged in some few others from the 1920s (Mexico, Turkey, Brazil, Egypt…). With few exceptions like the International Institute of Sociology and its journal, the *International Review of Sociology*, both founded by the French sociologist René Worms in 1893, there was no international structuration of the discipline and the circulation of books, ideas, concepts, authors and students was still limited. By contrast, after WWII, social sciences become more and more internationalized through the support of the newly created UNESCO (see below), while the Cold War has created a new global environment in which social sciences get instrumentalized on the Western side in order to contain or roll

back Communist influence. The American political, economic, and geopolitical hegemony is coupled with a growing epistemic hegemony revolving around the domination of Talcott Parsons' structural functionalism and the elaboration of the development and modernization theoretical and methodological framework during the 1950s. Therefore, the new wave of social sciences in many European, Latin American, or Asian countries[5] does not take place in the same geo-epistemic conditions as the older ones.

To give but a few milestones as far as Asia is concerned, between the early 1950s and the early 1970s, new national sociological associations are established: India (1951), the Philippines (1952), South Korea (1956), Pakistan (1963), Australia and New Zealand (1963) to cite but a few; new independent sociology departments are created: Seoul (1946), Yogyakarta (1948), Quezon (1950), Kyong-Buk (1954), Tehran (1957), Dacca (1957), Karachi (1961), Manila (1962), Chulalongkorn (1964), Hyderabad (1964), Wellington (1967), Jakarta (1968), Chittagong (1970), Auckland (1970); and new journals are founded: *Japanese Sociological Review* (1950), *Sociological Bulletin* (1952), *Philippines Sociological Review* (1953), *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (1957), *Korean Journal of Sociology* (1964), *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* (1967)… This social science boom, that I cannot thoroughly trace here, was quite often accompanied with the domination of Western – mostly American – sociology or anthropology. However, it is possible to observe, starting in the mid-1960s, a rather common indigenization trend aiming at setting up a national reflection about the possibilities to challenge Western social science on the one hand, and to elaborate new concepts and approaches grounded in the national culture and in national traditions in order to achieve a better description of the society under consideration. The issue of the non-relevance of Western concepts and theories is here of particular importance. If the chronology of this second counter-hegemonic or indigenizing moment is not exactly the same in all Asian countries – for instance it takes a new form in India from the late 1950s onwards in a direct confrontation with the French anthropologist Louis Dumont (Lardinois, 1995) – a shared, and yet apparently stemming from national concerns, framework becomes visible in the mid-1960s. One of its most eloquent manifestation is the Pilipino movement in the Philippines that started with the communication specialist Gloria Feliciano's article on the limits of Western social research methods (Feliciano, 1965) and reached a peak in the field of psychology with the development of the so-called

[5] In most African countries, the emergence of non-colonial social sciences takes place a bit later, at least starting in the early 1960s.

"Filipino psychology" (*Sikolohiyang Pilipino*) from 1975 onwards (see Enriquez, 1987). In the more restricted field of sociology, one can mention the Korean case where the first traces of a quest towards indigenization – *tochakhwa* in Korean, 토착화- can be observed from 1970 on with discussion being held in the Korean Sociological Association (Kim, 1985). These debates became more and more intense throughout the 1970s, with special sessions devoted to "Reflections on Korean Social Sciences" in 1972 and "Universality and Particularity of Social Science Theories" in 1973 (Kim, 2017, p. 12). It culminated in 1979 with the organization of the meeting of the Korean Social Science Research Council on "Koreanization of Western Approaches to Social Sciences".

Notions of relevance and of autonomy, the latter being best exemplified with the use by the Indian sociologist Jit Pal Singh Uberoi of the word *swaraj* to describe the objective of Indian sociology (Uberoi, 1968), are among the most used in the different national social sciences in Asia from the 1960s onwards. In this period and in this region, one of the most interesting figures is certainly the Malaysian sociologist Syed Hussein Alatas. After obtaining a PhD in Political and Social Sciences from the University of Amsterdam in 1963, his dissertation being devoted to "Reflections on the theories of religion" (Alatas, 1963b; see also 1963a), he came back to Malaysia where he joined the department of Malay Studies at the University of Malaya at Kuala Lumpur. In 1967, he founded the department of Malay Studies at the University of Singapore while being intensively engaged in politics in Malaysia, as a President of the Malaysian People's Movement Party between 1968 and 1971, a member of the National Malaysian Consultative Council from 1969 until 1971, and as a senator in 1971 (on Alatas, see for instance Hassan, 2005). From the early 1970s, he was extremely active in denunciating, not from a Malaysian, but rather from an Asian point of view, the consequences of Western academic domination on the social sciences practiced and taught in the developing countries[6]. As early as 1972, and again in 1974, he presented his thoughts in the *International Social Science Journal* (S.H. Alatas, 1972 and 1974), a review founded by UNESCO in 1949, by resorting to the metaphor of the "captive mind" that helped him describe the peculiar condition of students in developing studies, who are taught Western social science without any single adaptation of the teaching:

> There is not a single university in Asia that realizes the need to introduce a special course on captive thinking in the sciences, to make students aware of the need to adapt the sciences which they imbibe from Western sources. What happens is a mere

[6] A first version of his vision had already been published in 1956 (S.H. Alatas, 1956).

> transplantation of thought. Again I do not mean here a simple adaptation of techniques and methodologies but of the conceptual apparatus, systems of analysis, and selection of problems (Alatas, 1974, p. 695).

The peculiarity of this situation comes from the fact the the Western social science is taught under the guise of universal social science by instructors who have themselves been trained in the West and do only reproduce in their teaching the epistemic domination of one part of the world upon the others, Asia included:

> Another great problem of the captive mind is that it is not able to differentiate the universal from the particular: it subsumes both under the universal. When a captive mind studies the sciences from the West, phenomena which are distinctly Western are often considered to be universal. This is a trend which, for lack of better terms, I would suggest we call 'methodological imperialism'. (*Ibid*.)

Both conditions of "captive" and "captor" minds cannot find any solution, according to Alatas, unless two distinct processes take place, namely the denunciation of the almost systematic irrelevance of Western concepts and theories for the description of developing societies, but also the elaboration of alternative social sciences anchored in their own societies, a task that should be undertaken not only in Malaysia or in Singapore, but in all Asia:

> What is needed for the study of developing areas is not merely to point out the inadequacies of current models and analyses uncritically derived from Western scholars and social science. What we need are alternative models, methodologies and concepts to modify, supplement, or substitute those already available. This could and should be done by Asian scholars for strictly scientific reasons (S.H. Alatas, 1972, p. 20).

Quite interestingly, in his 1974 article, Alatas quotes from Jit Pal Singh Uberoi's 1968 article in *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (Uberoi, 1968), thus showing that, conversely to what seemed to be the case heretofore, some kind of mutual reading, use and quotation of other Asian social science scholars emerges, especially as new forms of connections are established between them through the organization of meetings, conferences and programmes throughout the 1970s, quite often under the aegis or even supervision of the UNESCO.

The UNESCO and Asia: international support and transnational work

Since the late 1940s, the UNESCO had become prominent in working towards the internationalization of social sciences, giving impetus for the establishment of both the International Sociological Association and International Political Science Association in 1949 (Platt, 1998; Boncourt, 2009), supporting the creation of the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) in 1957 (Beigel, 2009) and of the Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO) in 1967 (Stavenhagen, 2014). From the late 1960s, this commitment to strengthening teaching and research in social sciences in various parts of the world turns into a more oriented policy aiming at helping underdeveloped countries in building social research of their own without being forced to recourse to Western social science. Under the impulsion of the UNESCO[7], a series of transnational meetings were held, notably in Asia, during the 1970s, in order for social scientists to discuss the possibilities to favor a national and autonomous scientific development. It seems that a first gathering was held in Tokyo in the late 1960s under the aegis of the World Student Christian Federation to debate the "Relevance of social sciences in contemporary Asia" (WSCF, 1968)[8]. India was quite active in this quest. A conference devoted to teaching and research in Asia was organized in Simla in May 1973 (Atal, 1974), with the Indian sociologist Yogesh Atal as the main leading person. His figure is of particular importance if one wants to understand the dynamics of the inter-Asian debates about autonomous academic development. After getting a Medicine BA in Udaipur in 1957, he turned to social science, obtaining at the University of Sagar a BA and a MA (in respectively 1959 and 1962) before becoming a Social anthropology doctor from the same university in 1966. He had been an Associate Professor at the Indian Institute of Technology for four years (1968-1972), before he was appointed in 1972 Director of the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) that had been created by the Indian government in 1969. This responsibility certainly made him enter the networks of the UNESCO since the ICSSR was a member of the International Social Science Council founded by the UNESCO in 1952 (Platt, 2002). Those two related but still independent paths – organizing social science in India and being close to the UNESCO – became more and more intricate when he gathered in Simla a variety of Asian researchers from twelve Asian countries (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia,

---

[7] This can be understood as a form of return to the "periphery principle" enunciated by the British biochemist, sinologist and first Director (1946–948) of the Natural Sciences section of the UNESCO Joseph Needham in his 1946 report (Needham, 1946, p.). On Needham, the periphery principle and the UNESCO, see Petitjean (2006).

[8] Despite my efforts I have not been able to locate a copy of the book published as the proceedings of this meeting nor know any further about the conditions of the organization of the meeting.

India, Indonesia, Iran, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Sri Lanka and Thailand[9]). The Conference ended with the formal creation of the Association of Asian Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC). The year after, Atal was appointed Regional Adviser for Social Sciences in the Asia-Pacific Region at the UNESCO, a position he occupied until 1987 and that he used to both make Asian social sciences better known through the publications of books (for instance Atal, 1985) and to promote the idea of indigenizing social sciences in general, and Asian ones in particular, as it is visible from the symposium about "The Indigenization of the Social Sciences" during the Third Conference of the ASSREC in Manila in September 1979 as well as from his "A Call for Indigenization"1981 article (Atal, 1981).

This evolution takes place against the backdrop of an important transformation in the international framework for development policies, namely the rise of the notion of "endogenous development". Apparently first used within the UNESCO, notably by its French Director-General René Maheu (he was elected in 1961) as soon as 1963 (Maurel, 2009 and 2010), and further elaborated by the French Orientalist scholar Jacques Berque in a 1967 report, the notion emphasizes the necessity to promote, especially in the scientific and technological realms, forms of development that do not merely consist in importing from abroad, but actually rely on the country's cultural heritage. If the report does not use the phrase "endogenous development" per se, it discusses the issues associated to an alternative vision of development and it lists, among the "suggested areas for research", "the examination of possibilities of adaptation of traditional institutions, values and cultural originalities to the development process" (Berque, 1967: 19). The very same year, Maheu writes in his *Report on the activities of the organization in 1967* that "it can never be said too often that all real development must be endogenous" (UNESCO, 1968: 11). In the following years, this idea comes to occupy a place more and more important in the UNESCO discourse about development, with its climax certainly being the Medium-term plan 1977-1982 adopted by the General Assembly of the UNESCO in 1977. It is worth quoting this text at length for two main reasons: first, it's not often considered when dealing with the issue of development in general, and scientific development in particular; second it provides useful insights into the vocabulary of the period and into the rationale of paying more and more importance to endogeneity.

The first important information relates to the changing conception of development, from mostly exogenous to mostly endogenous:

---

[9] The absence of Japan might be considered as indicative of how Japan was not seen as an Asian but rather as a Western country at the time.

(The General Conference) ***Expresses its acceptance*** of the idea of development as an over-all, multidimensional and diversified process essentially endogenous in nature, linked with the values peculiar to each society and requiring the active participation of individuals and groups who are its agents and its beneficiaries; (…) (Unesco, 1977, p. VIII, emphasis in the original)

As a consequence, education in general is understood as needing endogeneity so as to respect the values inherent to each society: "(The General Conference) ***Endorses*** the idea that educational activity, which is closely linked with economic, social and cultural development, must be endogenous and that every society must provide for the promotion of education in ways which conform to its own structures and values;" (*Ibid*., emphasis in the original). This new framework provides a basis for a better understanding and knowledge of the various systems of values, which prompts the General Conference to include the following into the list of its objectives:

3.2 Studies of socio-cultural conditions, systems of values, motivations and procedures for participation by the population likely to foster endogenous, diversified development processes in keeping with the practical conditions and needs of the different societies.
3.3 Contribution to the development of infrastructures and programmes (sic) in the social sciences with a view to increasing the different societies' ability to find ways of solving social and human problems.
3.4 Development and application of tools and methods of socio-economic analysis and development planning.
3.5 Promotion of wider participation in cultural life and encouragement of endogenous activities.
3.6 Stimulation of artistic and intellectual creativity. (*Ibid*., p. IX)

Priorities having been modified, the emphasis is quite logically put on every possible way to favor the adoption or development of endogenous techniques in every country:

So, instead of importing technologies designed for another environment, it is better to try, whenever possible, to work out appropriate technologies in the developing countries themselves, taking into account a set of specific factors, including available resources, forms of energy to be used, the country's human potential. The establishment of a scientific and technological basis in every country must be

regarded as a high priority task. The endogenous development of the appropriate techniques must be the culmination of an educational and cultural effort combining scientific lines of approach with the heritage of the past. (*Ibid*., p. XXVII)

The second important information has to do with the relationship between the horizon of universalism and that of endogeneity. At first glance it might seem that the latter denies the former; yet the document is explicit in considering that, on the contrary, the more endogenous the development, the more universal it can be since it is much more likely to appeal to all people within the country in consideration and not only to an elite:

> In this connexion (sic), it is advisable to consider assigning a significant role to endeavours to reinstate technical traditions age-old skills which have long been neglected in the name of modernity. Because they tend to be regarded as a way of reasserting the cultural characteristics of a society, they can be an excellent means of winning the confidence of the whole population, and not just of an élite, so as to start a general movement towards a form of development benefiting widely from the participation and initiative of every individual. This approach is likely to prove successful in stimulating endogenous creativity. It is perhaps because it is rooted in a specific culture that this endogenous creativity can make a contribution which may prove to be of universal value (*Ibid*.).

Universality in this respect might be seen as a different notion from universalism. Whereas the latter usually pertains to the vocabulary of identity and similitude, the universalism of development being tantamount to the existence of a single driving force applying to all countries and making it possible to inscribe each and every country into a single development ladder, the former implies the acknowledgement of the diversity of human systems, values being placed at the core of the notion of development. Given the fact that "respect and furtherance of cultural identity are at the very heart of all striving towards endogenous development" (*Ibid*., p. 16), "development in its universality and diversity is a process which is found everywhere, but its centre is nowhere" (*Ibid*., p. XXXI).

The adoption of an "endogenous development" policy at the UNESCO had the chance to be all the more efficient as the United Nations had recently followed a similar turn. In the wake of the discussions that had been going on since the late 1960s among developing countries within the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) about changing the economic rules of the games at the international level

(Rothstein, 2015), the General Assembly of the United Nations had voted a Declaration for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order in May 1974 (see Menon, 1977; Hart, 1983). This new goal also made its way through the promotion of an endogenous conception of development, as it appears for instance in the Report of the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation prepared for the Seventh Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly in September 1975. First stating that "development is endogenous; it springs from the heart of each society, which relies first on its own strength and resources and defines in sovereignty the vision of its future, cooperating with societies sharing its problems and aspirations", the Report continues by claiming that "the international community as a whole has a responsibility of guaranteeing the conditions for the self-reliant development of each society (…). This is the very essence of the new international order (…)." (Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, 1975, p. 7). This new relationship between development and endogeneity found a new path in 1976 with the opening in Tokyo of the United Nations University (UNU), a project that had been discussed within the UNESCO from the late 1960s and formally established in 1973. In 1975, a program entitled Human and Social Development was developed within the UNU. In 1977, it gave birth to a specific project – named Socio-Cultural Development Alternatives in a Changing World (SCA) – under the scientific supervision of the Egyptian economist living in France Anouar Abdel-Malek[10], this project unfolding into two sub-projects, the first one being Endogenous Intellectual Creativity, and the second one Transformations of the World. The SCA project linked together many researchers from diverse parts of the world (Asia, Latin America, the Arab world, Eastern and Central Europe) between 1978 and 1982) in several conferences held in Kyoto, Beograd, Mexico or Kuwait City. The first regional conference on "endogenous intellectual creativity" was held in Kyoto (13-17 November 1978) and it gathered 67 participants coming from Singapore, Indonesia, India, Japan, China, Philippines, France, Malaysia, the USA, Vietnam, Thailand, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Brazil, Mexico, Canada, Fiji, Great-Britain and Yugoslavia (Abdel-Malek and Pandeya, 1980)[11].

If this article does not allow us to dwell at length on the rich content of the proceedings published two years after, it might suffice at this stage to give some quick insights related to the issue of indigenization[12]. First, this symposium was certainly the first time that so many social scientists coming from different countries discussed the

[10] On Abdel-Malek, see Brisson (2008).

[11] The second regional conference, held in Mexico (23-29 April 1979) was devoted to Latin America and the Caribbean (Gonzalez Casanova, 1984)

[12] For another vision more centered on the Third World and political issues, see Brisson (forthcoming).

possibility to build a more autonomous social science in relation to the Western domination in this domain. This can be illustrated with the words by K.J. Ratnam, the Director of the Centre for Policy Research in Penang (Malaysia):

> Present activities and networks are clearly Western dominated, and the intellectual core of social science is similarly a production of Western experience and tradition. An alternative thrust is clearly needed, for without it the incorporation and eventual integration of Asian and other non-Western contributions may not proceed beyond the stage of token examples. If a new consciousness is needed, it will to some extent have to be cultivated deliberately because otherwise the influence of the existing social science «system» may prove too difficult to resist. (…) Genuine creativity and a more than passive contribution would therefore appear to be unlikely within this framework and this makes it all the more important for Asian social scientists to set their own priorities and to forge new intellectual links among themselves (…) (Ratnam, 1980, p. 140).

Second, if some contributions to the symposium clearly focus on "national" intellectual traditions, the search for endogenous academic development is also counterbalanced by a pragmatic emphasis on the necessity not to confound endogeneity and nativism in the social sciences. Therefore, Kawano Kenji, the then Director of the Institute for Research in Institute for Humanisties at Kyoto University insists on the importance of mutual relations between researchers and conceptions of social science:

> But we have to realize that the idea that every nation has a unique and genuine culture originating from within is only a misconception deriving from the ideology of traditionalism. No culture can develop solely by its own force without influencing and being influenced by others. (…) We should not mistake "endogeneity" with "genuineness" or "closeness". "Endogeneity" should be compatible with "globalness" (Kawano, 1980, p. 12).

Third, and completely in line with the above, endogeneity does not preclude contact with and even reliance on the outside academic world. In his contribution to the symposium, among seven obstacles to endogenous intellectual creativity, Syed Hussein Alatas specifies that "the relation with the West" has created in developing countries "a community of captive minds among the intelligentsia" (Alatas, 1980, p. 466). However, he does consider that "the the term endogenous should emphasize the activity rather than

the material used for the construction". In this respect, "the efforts of an Asian scholar to apply critically Marx's theory to the Asiatic mode of production, for instance, is to be regarded as endogenous" (*Ibid*., p. 462).

This complex understanding of endogeneity recalls the conceptual elaboration proposed by the Philippine psychologist Virgilio Enriquez from the mid-1970s to establish a Filipino psychology that would be decolonized. His conception of indigenization distinguishes between indigenization from without that searches for local equivalents of universal concepts, and indigenization from within (or cultural revalidation) (Enriquez, 1987; see also Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino, 2000). At about the same time, Krishna Kumar had stigmatized any resort to what he called "theoretic indigenization", namely the attempt at building specific and separate theories instead of working towards transnational collaborations in the social sciences (Kumar, 1978, and 1979). Many more other perspectives could be added to those both, from Yogesh Atal's ambiguous insistence on the "deparochialization of Western social sciences" (Atal, 1981, p. 196) to Syed Farid Alatas' later appeal – following on this his father's path – to distinguish between nativist and autonomous social science (S.F. Alatas, 2006: p. 108 et seq.). It remains that indigenization – whatever the actual meaning associated to it – always implies a tension between where sociology is practiced and where the concepts and theories come from. The responses to this tension vary greatly, from the autochtonous nativism rejecting any kind of conceptual importation or collaboration to a more open acceptation of foreign academic influences.

It was not possible within the limits of this article to thoroughly investigate several decades of Asian counter-reactions to Western hegemony in the social sciences (Interesting examples are Alatas, 2006; and Chen, 2010). Doing so would notably imply devoting much more space to the national settings in which these epistemic indigenizing endeavors took place, as well as studying the various transnational arenas and networks that contributed to the formation of a more-than-national set of proposals. However, turning back to some often forgotten episodes of social science in Asia offers new possibilities to understand the present state of the debate within the discipline, when the multiplication of critiques addressed to sociological Eurocentrism or Occidentalism does not yet result in global attempts at building a renewed universal social science based on the acknowledgement of a diversity of national traditions without making them separate islands and rather connecting them to produce a world sociological archipelago (for some contemporary reflections on the possibility of a "post-Western sociology", see Roulleau-Berger, 2016; Kuhn and Vessuri, 2016).

The temptation and the claim to build social science at an "indigenous" level or from an "indigenous" point of view as a reaction to epistemic hegemony is highly understandable, and must therefore be understood as a specific epistemological gesture. In this respect, "indigenous" was more often than not the name of the claim itself as well as the ground on which this claim could be founded. However, the very issue of indigenization is problematic for it is only seldom understood conceptually, and rather inscribed, whether by its proponents or by its opponents, within the vocabulary of politics, thus associating it with mere desires of revenge that would necessarily be tainted with anti-Western feeling and attempts to find a way out of hegemony by inventing a social science of one's own, with specific and local horizons, concepts, audience and scholars. Hence the common misunderstanding arising as soon as the idea of autonomous, local, indigenous, native or whatever other term denoting the intention to move away from the heretofore universal and universalistic social science is brandished into the most legitimate and international arenas of the discipline. The cases of the Nigerian sociologist Akinsola Akiwowo's (1986, and 1988) calls for "indigenous sociology" in the 1980s and of both edited volumes on the diversity of sociological traditions by Sujata Patel (2010) and Michael Burawoy, Mau-kuei Chang and Michelle Fei-yu Hsieh (2010) being received with accusation of fragmenting the discipline (Archer, 1991; Sztompka, 2011; Burawoy, 2011) amply demonstrate how much indigenization was and can still be understood as a denial of any universality of the discipline. Historicizing indigenization by showing its complexity and its understanding as the only real option – when separated from mere nativism – in order to challenge Western hegemony is certainly some of the possible ways to make the debate about the future of social science and a more inclusive sociology less passionate and all the more feasible.

References

Abdel-Malek Anouar and Amar Nath Pandeya (eds.) 1980. *Intellectual Creativity in Endogenous Culture*, Tokyo: The United Nations University.

Abrams Philip, Rosemary Deem, Janet Finch and Paul Rock (eds.) 1981. *Practice and Progress: British Sociology, 1950-1980*, London: Allen and Unwin.

Akiwowo Akinsola. 1986, "Contribution to the Sociology of Knowledge from an African Oral Poetry", *International Sociology*, vol. 1, n° 4, p. 343-358.

Akiwowo Akinsola. 1988. "Universalism and Indigenisation in Sociological Theory: Introduction", *International Sociology*, vol. 3, n° 2, p. 155-160.

Alatas Syed Farid & Vineeta Sinha. 2017, *Sociological Theory beyond the Canon*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Alatas Syed Farid. 2006. *Alternative Discourses in Asian Social Science: Responses to Eurocentrism*, New Delhi, Sage.

Alatas Syed Hussein. 2002. "The Development of an Autonomous Social Science Tradition in Asia: Problems and Prospects", *Asian Journal of Social Science*, vol. 30, n° 1, p. 150-157.

Alatas Syed Hussein. 1980. "Some Aspects of Endogenous Intellectual Creativity: The Problem of Obstacles – Guidelines for Research", in Abdel-Malek Anouar and Amar Nath Pandeya (eds.), *Intellectual Creativity in Endogenous Culture*, Tokyo: The United Nations University, p. 462-470.

Alatas Syed Hussein. 1974. "The Captive Mind and Creative Development", *International Social Science Journal*, vol. XXVI, n° 4, p. 691-700.

Alatas Syed Hussein. 1972. "The Captive Mind in Development Studies. Some Neglected Problems and the Need for an Autonomous Social Science Tradition in Asia", *International Social Science Journal*, vol. XXIV, n° 1, p. 9-25.

Alatas Syed Hussein. 1963a. "The Weber Thesis and South East Asia", *Archives de sociologie des religions*, n° 15, p. 21-34.

Alatas Syed Hussein. 1963b. *Reflections on the Theories of Religion*, The Hague, Drukkerij Pasmans.

Alatas Syed Hussein. 1956. "Some Fundamental Problems of Colonialism", *Eastern World*, vol. 10, November, p. 9-10.

Atal Yogesh. 2003. "Reminiscing on the Eve of AASSREC's 30th Anniversary", Address before the 15th Biennial General Conference of the Association of Asian Social Research Councils, Canberra, November, available online: http:// www.aassrec.org/ conferences/ 2003.

Atal Yogesh (ed.) 1985. *Sociology* and *Social AnthropologyinAsiaand the Pacific*, New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Ltd.

Atal Yogesh. 1981. "The Call for Indigenization", *International Social Science Journal*, vol.XXXIII, n° 1, p. 189-197.

Atal Yogesh (ed.) 1974. *Social Sciences in Asia*, New Delhi, Abhinav Publications.

Archer Margaret. 1991. "Presidential Address: Sociology for One World: Unity and Diversity", *International Sociology*, vol. 6, n° 2, p. 131-147.

Baba Akio. 1962. "The History of Sociology in Japan", *The Sociological Review*, vol. 10, n° 51, p.7-13.

Baldock Cora V., and James Lally. 1974. *Sociology in Australia and New Zealand. Theory and Method*, Westport, Greenwood Press.

Bayle Paola Adriana. 2015. "Conectando sures. La construcción de redes académicas entre América Latina y África", *Iconos*, n° 53, p. 153-170.

Beigel Fernanda. 2009. "La Flacso chilena y la regionalización de las ciencias sociales en América Latina (1957-1973)", *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, vol. 71, n° 2, p. 319-349.

Beilharz Peter, Trevor Hogan, and Sheila Shaver. 2015. *The Martin Presence. Jean Martin and the Making of the Social Sciences in Australia*, Sydney, University of New South Wales.

Berque Jacques, 1967, *The Role of the Human Factor in the Development of the Newly Independent Countries, With an Annotated Bibliography*, Paris: UNESCO.

Boncourt Thibaud. 2009. *A History of the International Political Science Association*, Montréal: IPSA.

Brisson Thomas. (forthcoming). "L'Occident/ L'Orient comme enjeux épistémiques: Crise du tiers-mondisme, connexions transnationales et déterminations politiques des critiques anti-occidentales (Abdel-Malek, Alatas, Chatterjee)", to be published in Del Fiol Maxime and Claire Mitratre (eds.), *L'Occident au prisme de l'Islam* (*The West through the prism of Islam*), Paris: Geuthner.

Brisson Thomas. 2015. "Western and Non-Western Views of the Social and Behavioral Sciences: De-Westernizing the Social and Behavioral Sciences", *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences* (2nd edition), vol. 25, Oxford: Elsevier, p. 541-550.

Brisson Thomas, 2008, *Les Intellectuels arabes et la France* (*Arab Intellectuals and France*), Paris: La Dispute.

Brooks Van Wyck. 1962. "Ernest Fenollosa and Japan", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 106, n° 2, p. 106-110.

Burawoy Michael, Mau-kuei Chang and Michelle Fei-yu Hsieh, eds. 2010, *Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for A Global Sociology*, Taipei, Academia Sinica, 3 vol.

Burawoy Michael. 2011. "The Last Positivist", *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 40, n° 4, p. 396-404.

Chen Hon Fai. 2018. *Chinese Sociology: State-Building and the Institutionalization of Globally Circulated Knowledge*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Chen Kuan-hsing. 2010. *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Clinton Godart G. 2016. "Spencerism in Japan: Boom and Bust of a Theory", in Lightman Bernard. (dir.) *Global Spencerism. The Communication and Appropriation of a British Evolutionist*, Leiden: Brill, p. 56-77.

Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. 1975. *What Now. The 1975 Dag Hammarskjöld Report on Development and International Cooperation*, Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.

Devés-Valdés Eduardo. 2012. *Pensamiento periferico. Una tesis interpretiva global*, Santiago de Chile, IDEA-USACH.

Dirlik Arif. 2012. "*Zhongguohua*: Worlding China. The Case of Sociology and Anthropology in 20th-century China", in Dirlik Arif, Guannan Li and Hsiao-Pei Yen (eds.), *Sociology and Anthropology in Twentieth-Century China: BetweenUniversalismand Indigenism*, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, p. 1-39.

Enriquez Virgilio. 1987. "Decolonizing the Filipino psyche: Impetus for the development of psychology in the Philippines", in Blowers Geoffrey H. and Alison M. Turtle (eds.), *Psychology Moving East: The Status of Western Psychology in Asia and Oceania*, Boulder and London: Westview Press, p.265-287.

Feliciano Gloria. 1965. "Limits of Western Social Science Research Methods in Rural Philippines: The Need for Innovation", *Lipunan*, vol. 1, n° 1, p. 114-128.

Gardezi Hassan N. 1975. “Contemporary Sociology in Pakistan and Bangladesh”, in Mohan Raj P., and Don Martindale (eds.), *Handbook of Contemporary Developments in World Sociology*, Westport: Greenwood Press, p. 413-422.

Gianninoto Mariarosaria. 2013. “*Qunxue or Shehuixue*: First Steps in the Introduction of Sociology into China and the Formation of Sociological Lexicon”, in Rošker Jana S. and NatašaV. Suhadolnik (eds.), *Modernisation of Chinese Culture: Continuity and Change*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, p.279-294.

González Casanova Pablo (dir.), 1984, *Cultura y creación intelectual en América Latina*, Mexico: Siglo Veitiuno.

Halsey Albert Henry. 2004. *A HistoryofSociologyinBritain: Science, Literature, and. Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harley Kirsten, and Gary Wickham. 2014. *Australian Sociology: Fragility, Survival, Rivalry*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Hart Jeffrey H. 1983. *The New International Economic Order: Conflict and Cooperation in North-South Economic Relations, 1974-1977*, London: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Hassan Riaz (ed.) 2005. *Local and Global: Social Transformation in Southeast Asia. Essays in Honour of Professor Syed Hussein and Alatas*, Leiden: Brill.

Holmwood John, and John Scott (eds.) 2014. *The Palgrave Handbook of Sociology in Britain*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Howland Douglas R. 2002. *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan*, Honolulu, University of Hawai Press.

Huang M.K.W. 2012. “The War of Neologisms: The Competition between the Newly Translated Terms Invented by Yan Fu and by the Japanese in the Late Qing”, in St André J. et Peng H.-y. (eds.), *China and Its Others. Knowledge Transfer through Translation, 1829-2010*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, p. 51-70.

Kawamura Nozomu 1994. *Sociology and Society in Japan*, New York: Paul Kegan.

Kawano Kenji. 1980. “Endogeneity and Globalness of Culture”, in Abdel-Malek Anouar and Amar Nath Pandeya (eds.), *Intellectual Creativity in Endogenous Culture*, Tokyo: The United Nations University, p. 10-13.

Kim Kyong-Dong. 2017. *Alternative Discourses on Modernization and Development: East Asian Perspectives*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Kim Kyong-Dong. 1985. “Republic of Korea”, in Atal Yogesh (ed.), *Sociology and Social Anthropology in Asia and the Pacific*, New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Ltd., p. 86-131.

King Ambrose Yeo-chi (with Wang Tse-sang). 1978. “The Development and Death of Chinese Academic Sociology: A Chapter in the Sociology of Sociology”, *Modem Asian Studies*, vol. 12, n° 1, p. 37-58.

Kuhn Michael, and Hebe Vessuri (eds.) 2016. *The Global Social Sciences: Under and Beyond European Universalism*, Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag.

Kumar Krishna. 1979. “Indigenization and Transnational Cooperation in the Social Sciences”, in Kumar

Krishna (ed.), *Bonds without Bondage: Exploration in Transcultural Interactions*, Honolulu, East-West Cultural Learning Institute, p. 103-119.

Kumar Krishna. 1978. "Some Reflections on Transnational Social Science Transactions", *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, vol. 19, n° 3-4, p. 219-234.

Lardinois Roland. 1995. "Louis Dumont et la science indigène" (*Louis Dumont and Indigenous Science*), *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, n° 106-107, p. 11-26.

Li Guannan. 2012. "The Synthesis School and the Founding of 'Orthodox' and 'Authentic' Sociology in Nationalist China: Sun Benwen's Sociological Thinking and Practice", in Dirlik Arif, Guannan Li and Hsiao-Pei Yen (eds.), *Sociology and Anthropology in Twentieth-Century China: Between Universalismand Indigenism*, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, p. 63-87.

Lightman Bernard (dir.) 2016. *Global Spencerism. The Communication and Appropriation of a British Evolutionist*, Leiden: Brill.

Lippert Wolfgang. 2001. "Language in the Modernization Process: The Integration of Western Concepts and Terms into Chinese and Japanese in the Nineteenth Century", in Lackner Michael, Iwo Amelung and Joachim Kurts (eds.), *New Terms for New Ideas. Western Knowledge and Lexical Change in Late Imperial China*, Leiden, Brill, p. 57-66.

Maurel Chloé, 2010, *Histoire de l'UNESCO. Les trente premières années, 1945-1974* (*History of the Unesco. The first thirty years, 1945-1974*), Paris: L'Harmattan.

Maurel, Chloé, 2009, "L'Unesco: un âge d'or de l'aide au développement par l'éducation (1945-1975)", *Cahiers d'histoire. Revue d'histoire critique*, n° 108, p. 145-170.

Menon Bhaskar P. 1977. *Global Dialogue: The New International Economic Order*, Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Munshi Indra. 2013. "On the Margins of Sociology: An Appreciation of Patrick Geddes's Work in India", *Sociological Bulletin*, vol. 62, n° 2, p. 217-238.

Nishitani Osamu. 2013. "Le japonais", in Legendre Pierre (dir.), *Tour du monde des concepts* (*Concepts around the World*), Paris: Fayard, p. 289-313.

Odaka Kunio. 1950. "Japanese Sociology:Past and Present", *Social Forces*, vol. 28, n° 4, p.400-409.

Patel Sujata (ed.) 2010. *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions*, London: Sage.

Patel Sujata. 2002. "The Profession and Its Association: Five Decades of the Indian Sociological Society", *International Sociology*, vol. 17, n° 2, p. 269-284.

Pe-Pua Rogelia and Protacio-Marcelino Elizabeth. 2000. "Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino Psychology): A Legacy of Virgilio G. Enriquez", *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, p. 49-71.

Petitjean Patrick. 2006. "The 'Periphery Principle': UNESCO and the International Commitment of Scientists after World War II", communication to the 2nd Congress of the European Society of the History of Science, Krakow (Poland), 6-9 September, available online: http://www.2iceshs.cyfronet.pl/2ICESHS_Proceedings/Chapter_25/R-17_Petitjean.pdf

Platt Jennifer. 2002. *Fifty Yearsof the International Social Science Council*, Paris:International Social Science

Council.

Platt Jennifer. 1998. *A Brief History of the ISA*, Montréal: ISA.

Ratnam K.J. 1980. “Endogenous Intellectual Creativity in the Social Sciences”, in Abdel-Malek Anouar and Amar Nath Pandeya (eds.), *Intellectual Creativity in Endogenous Culture*, Tokyo: The United Nations University, p. 140.

Rothstein Robert. 2015. *Global Bargaining. UNCTAD and the Quest for a New International Economic Order*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Roulleau-Berger Laurence. 2016. *Post-Western Revolution in Sociology. From China to Europe*, Leiden: Brill.

Saitō Tsuyoshi. 2015. “The Formation of the Term Shakai (Society)”, in Fogel Joshua A. (ed.) *The Emergence of the Modern Sino-Japanese Lexicon: Seven Studies*, Leiden: Brill, p. 29-80.

Stavenhagen Rodolfo. 2014. “FLACSO, CLACSO y la búsqueda de una sociología latinoamericana”, *Perfiles latinoamericanos*, vol. 22, n° 43, p. 7-17.

Steinmetz George (ed.) 2013. *Sociology & Empire. The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Sun Benwen (written Pen-Wen in this article). 1949. “Sociology in China”, *Social Forces*, vol. 27, n° 3, p. 247-251.

Sztompka Piotr. 2011. “ Another Sociological Utopia ”, *Contemporary Sociology*, 40(4), p. 388-396.

Thakur Manish K. 2015. “The Politics of Indigenous Social Science: Invoking a Lucknow Sociologist”, *Society and Culture in South Asia*, vol. 1, n° 2, p. 109-126.

Thakur Manish K. 2012. “Radhakamal Mukerjee and the Quest for an Indian Sociology”, *Sociological Bulletin*, vol. 61, n° 1, p. 89-108.

Uberoi Jit Pal Singh. 1968, “Science and Swaraj”, *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, vol. 2, n° 1, p.119-123.

UNCTAD. 2004. *Beyond Conventional Wisdomin Development Policy 1964-2004: An Intellectual History of UNCTAD*, New York and Geneva: United Nations.

UNESCO, 1968, *Report of the Director-General on the Activities of the Organization*, Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO, 1977, *Medium-Term Plan 1977-1982*, Paris: UNESCO.

Wong Siu-lun. 1979. *Sociology and Socialism in Contemporary China*, Londres: Routledge and Kegan.

World Student Christian Federation. 1968. *The Relevance of the Social Sciences in Contemporary Asia*, Tokyo: WSCF, 1968.

Yazawa Shujiro. 2013. “A Note on the History of Sociology in Japan”, in Kuhn Michael and Kazumi Okamoto (eds.), *Spatial Social Thought: Local Knowledge in Global Science Encounters, Stuttgart*, ibidem-Verlag, p. 129-153.